DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 174 076 HE 011 416

AUTHOR McCollester, Charles W.; Farrell, Richard L., Jr.
TITLE Teaching Activity Report: A Concise and Simple Summary of Individual Instructional Effort. AIR Forum 1979 Paper.
PUB DATE May 79
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research (19th, San Diego, California, May 13-17, 1979); Appended charts may not reproduce well

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; *College Instruction; *Computer Oriented Programs; *Faculty Evaluation; Faculty Workload; Higher Education; Information Needs; *Information Systems; Institutional Research; Reports; Student Evaluation of Teacher Performance
IDENTIFIERS *AIR Forum 1979; *Notre Dame University IN

ABSTRACT

The University of Notre Dame developed the Teaching Activity Report in an effort to present professors with meaningful summaries of their individual instructional efforts each semester. Geared to meet the needs of the individual instructors and their superiors, the Teaching Activity Report synthesizes all facets of the individual's instructional effort into a concise, readily understandable format. Every class is identified by title and course number (in order to reveal the level of instruction), by enrollment, and by both credit and contact (clock) hours. Instructors are identified by name, rank, and home department. An analysis of the grades assigned to the students by the instructor and a Teacher-Course Evaluation score based on student evaluations of each professor on 18 specific attributes are included for each course taught. The Report is produced by a series of COBOL programs which build a cumulative data file from existing data files. The summary reports have proved valuable to the instructors as realistic yardsticks of their ability to meet changing challenges and valuable to administrators, especially department chairpersons, in their efforts to make the best possible use of the individual's talents and interests, measured objectively. An interpretation of the letter grade designators used in the system and a sample Teaching Activity Report are appended. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED174076

THE ASSOCIATION FOR INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

This paper was presented at the Nineteenth Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research held at the Town and Country Inn in San Diego, California, May 13-17, 1979. This paper was reviewed by the AIR Forum Publications Committee and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC collection of Forum papers.

Mary Corcoran
University of Minnesota
(Editor, AIR Forum Publications)

HE 011 216

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AIR

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

TEACHING ACTIVITY REPORT: A CONCISE AND SIMPLE SUMMARY OF INDIVIDUAL INSTRUCTIONAL EFFORT *

Charles W. McCollester

and

Richard L. Farrell, Jr.

Analytical Studies
Office of the Dean of Administration
University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, Ind.

* We gratefully acknowledge the assistance of Erik Freitag, formerly of the Notre Dame Information Systems office, and Mary Toll, of the University Computing Center. Without their aid, the technical side of producing a Teaching Activity Report would have been beyond the authors' capabilities.

#69

Abstract: The University of Notre Dame's Teaching Activity Report (TAR) resulted from an effort to present professors with meaningful pieces of instructional data, compressing the essentials into a single activity summary for each semester. Geared to meet the needs of the individual instructor and his superiors, the TAR synthesizes all aspects of the individual's instructional effort into a concise, readily understandable format. The report has proved valuable to the instructor as a realistic yardstick of his ability to meet changing challenges, and valuable to his superiors as well in their efforts to make the best possible use of the individual's talents and interests, measured objectively.

Definition and Description of the Problem

By the fall of 1975 the average teacher and administrator at Notre Dame found himself plagued by a great Paper Problem. Reports of all kinds were not only demanded of him but provided to him. In the latter case, at least, the intent was to be helpful; the result, however, was often directly the opposite.

Both teachers and administrators were in danger of being submerged in a bureaucratic sea: the reports they received, dealing with teacher-course evaluation scores, grade analyses, attrition, drop-add statistics, etc., were usually computerized, always detailed, and often baffling to all but the professional statistician. Their distribution was sometimes sporadic and often erratic; the complexity of reports issued teachers vis-a-vis administrators differed, so that comparability was difficult and discussion of them rendered nearly impossible.

The last bastion of civility in a helter-skelter world -- the university community -- seemed in danger of drowning in a sea of paper.

While the plight of the teacher/administrator may have been over-dramatized in the foregoing paragraphs, there is little doubt of the very real irritations and uncertainties that accompany such a situation.

Background and Purposes Behind Development of TAR

In the spring of 1976 the then-provost of the University of Notre Dame, Rev. James T. Burtchaell, C.S.C., contacted the Analytical Studies Office to discuss the possibility of compiling a concise and simple summary of individual instructional effort each semester.

Traditionally, production of student credit hours had been the only measure consistently used at Notre Dame to measure faculty productivity in the instructional area. However, since some courses lent themselves to large lecture classes while others did not, it was decided that the traditional method of assaying instructional effort was neither fair nor adequately descriptive.

It was decided that the focus would be on the contact hours of teachers with their classes and that even these must be massaged to avoid duplication in the case of team-taught courses and outright larceny in the case of cross-listed courses.

Finally, to provide the total objective viewpoint of instructional contact hours, grades assigned and students' evaluation of professors, it was decided to link together as many yardsticks of faculty (and teaching assistant) productivity as possible. Since a Teacher-Course Evaluation has been administered every semester to all classes since 1970, it seemed that an abbreviated version of these results should appear, and that the grades assigned by the professor should also be included. Every class could be identified by title and course number (thereby revealing the level of instruction), by enrollment, and by both credit and contact (clock) hours. Each teacher could be identified by name, rank, and home department.

The purposes behind this summary of all teaching activity were: (1) to eliminate the need of faculty and administration retaining separate and often complex reports focusing on special areas; (2) to provide all teachers with a simple and easily readable record of what they did, instruction-wise, in a given semester; (3) to enable these teachers to discuss their records with superiors with assurance that the records they were using were the same as those being used by their chairmen; (4) to enable administrators, especially chairmen, to judge whether a given professor performed more ably in large or small, or upper level, lower level or graduate classes, etc.

It was, of course, also planned that besides the simple but complete record of teaching activity, there would be a more extensive listing of academic and research publications during the same period; a statement of involvement in university and community activities, etc.; and a once-per-semester or once-per-academic year discussion between teacher and chairman concerning the instructional, public service and publication efforts of the individual. All of these would be duly recorded. Implementation of this second portion of the plan was temporarily deferred, although some departments are even now carrying it out on a regular basis.

Materials and Reports Utilized

The following reports were (and are) already being produced, and were utilized to produce a unified, skeletonized Teaching Activity Report: (1) a Teaching Load Analysis; (2) a Faculty Listing; (3) a Grade Analysis; (4) a Teacher-Course Evaluation report. The problem was how to link these reports together, highlight their more significant features, and do all this so simply, yet comprehensively, that an accurate summary of instructional activity for a given semester could be generated quickly.

The Faculty Listing is an annual report produced in the fall providing information on all faculty members under contract to Notre Dame for that year. An identification number, rank, full or part-time status, leave status, home department, etc., are among the items of information provided in this report.

The Teaching Load Analysis, produced each semester, is basically a record of every course taught in the University. The name of the instructor, his rank (teaching assistants are included here), the courses he/she teaches, the department in which these courses are taught, credit and contact hours produced, time and location of each course, enrollment, etc., are all to be found in this report.

The Teacher-Course Evaluation is administered in all courses at the University near the end of each semester. The results are run through a series of computer programs so that teachers, their chairmen and their Deans may weigh them from many angles. At Notre Dame, the TCE has a twofold purpose: (1) to improve the quality of teaching; and (2) to be used, in conjunction with other measures, to determine who the better teachers are.

The Teacher-Course Evaluation scores and the grades assigned students by the teacher were added to the elements derived from the faculty listing and teaching load. Usually, we are able to distribute the Teaching Activity Reports within 40 days after the semester ends. An example of what faculty members, teaching assistants and department chairmen receive is attached.

Solution: How conceptual goal was implemented.

The Teaching Activity Report (TAR) is produced by a series of COBOL programs which build a cumulative data file from existing data files. At Notre Dame we use seven COBOL programs to build the final report file. Five of the programs print out error listings, denoting missing items or incompatible data between the various files. This step-by-step cross-checking of data facilitates correction or update of the TAR file while in the building process.

The best approach to understanding the sequential steps involved in building the final TAR data file is by analyzing an individual professor's Teaching Activity Report.

The first portion of the TAR file created is the Heading. Exhibit A identifies the Heading information printed. Individual faculty name, rank and home department are on the left-hand side. Total enrollment, total unduplicated clock hours and total unduplicated student credit hours are on the right-hand side.

Total enrollment includes all students listed on class rosters: full-time, part-time and registered auditors.

Total unduplicated clock hours is best defined by an example. We are all aware of instances where a specified three (3)-credit course involves only two (2) hours of actual teaching plus one (1) hour of tutorial work per week. Total student-teacher contact: two (2) hours. Or, on the opposite spectrum, a three (3)-credit course involving three (3) hours of classroom teaching plus two (2) hours of teacher-supervised lab-work per week. Total student-teacher contact: five (5) hours. Both instances

dramatize the need for a more explicit determination of teaching work loads than simply authorized credit hours.

Notre Dame's answer is a separate classification for actual face-to-face teaching hours per week, what we term total unduplicated clock hours. It more explicitly defines teacher work loads, plus allowing consideration for non-credited teaching hours produced by graduate students. Thus, total unduplicated clock hours identifies the actual number of hours a teacher spends in direct contact with his or her students per week.

Total unduplicated student credit hours identifies, for each professor, the total number of allotted course credits with consideration for the number of students taught. The stated value is the sum of the products of these two factors for each course.

Heading information is generated by the first COBOL program, which reconciles the "Faculty Listing" (name, rank, status, etc.) with the "Course and Section Master" (course listings). The "Course and Section Master" is part of the Teaching Load Analysis Report. Each faculty member is cross-checked to verify that his or her course listings are properly assigned, and each course listing is cross-checked for the properly assigned faculty member. Certain variations are expected.

The first variation concerns cross-listed courses. A cross-listed course is a course listed and credited under two different departments, sometimes under two different titles. For example, as depicted in Exhibit A, a student may take a course in "Understanding Religious Convictions" for credit in either Philosophy or Theology. In our first program file,

cross-listed courses would appear as errors because a single faculty member would be specified as teaching two different courses at the same time.

By default, a second variation would be also highlighted -- team-taught courses. A team-taught course has more than one assigned faculty member. Again in Exhibit A, one sees "Systematic Theology" being taught by both Professors Hauerwas and Corbaci. As the "Faculty Listing" is comprised of individual entries, when matched with the "Course and Section Master," courses possessing more than one assigned teacher will be identified as errors.

The importance of these variations and their subsequent proper entry into the "Teaching Activity Report" (TAR) data file cannot be understated. They are a critical factor in the proper assignment of unduplicated credit and clock hours.

The second program incorporates class enrollment into the modified TAR file of faculty and course listings (updated for cross-listed and team-taught courses). From the Registrar's official "Enrollment Report" (part of the Teaching Load Analysis Report) comes the input for class sizes and assigned credit hours. These inputted factors, which were previously verified by each department chairman, form the basis for our computation of unduplicated credit and clock hours.

Exhibit B shows the Teaching Activity Report with enrollment figures, unduplicated clock hour and unduplicated credit hour information added. Total Enrollment is noted as "63" -- the sum total of all students listed on class rosters assigned to Professor Corbaci.

Total Unduplicated Clock Hours are noted as "7.50". In our particular example, this calculated figure is derived by the following computation:

(1) "Understanding Religious Convictions" is a cross-listed course. While the course is available for credit as either "Philosophy 552" or "Theology 631", Professor Corbaci meets face-to-face with the entire group (both those taking the course for credit in Theology and those in Philosophy) simultaneously for 3.00 clock hours per week. Thus he is authorized only 3.00 clock hours, not 6.00. 3.00

(2) "Systematic Theology" is a team-taught course. Although listed as a 3.00 clock hour course, Professor Corbaci shares this teaching assignment with Professor Hauerwas. Thus, both professors teach the course part-time, and each is entitled to 1.50 clock hours. 1.50

(3) Lastly, Professor Corbaci teaches "American Religious Thought" for an assigned rating of 3.00 clock hours per week. +3.00

Total Unduplicated Clock Hours 7.50

(A footnote at the bottom of the TAR listing summarizes the calculation of Total Unduplicated Clock Hours for team-taught and cross-listed courses.)

Total Unduplicated Student Credit Hours are calculated by multiplying the credit hours assigned for each course by the total course enrollment. In our example, Total Unduplicated Student Credit Hours are derived by the following computation:

(1) "Understanding Religious Convictions" has a total enrollment of 14 (4 in Philosophy 552 and 10 in Theology 631) and an assigned

credit hour rating of 3.00.

(3.00 credit hours x 14 enrolled students = 42 unduplicated credit hours)	42

(2) "Systematic Theology" has a total enrollment of 16. But recall however that "Systematic Theology" is a team-taught course and the assigned credit hours of 3.00 must be divided by 2. Therefore, credit hours are 1.50, not 3.00.

(1.50 credit hours x 16 enrolled students = 24 unduplicated credit hours)	24

(3) "American Religious Thought" has an enrollment of 33 and unduplicated credit hours of 3.00.

(3.00 credit hours x 33 enrolled students = 99 unduplicated credit hours)	+99
Total Unduplicated Student Credit Hours	165.00

At the end of every semester students have an opportunity to grade each professor on twenty (20) specific attributes of teaching. The third program incorporates the assigned Teacher-Course Evaluation (TCE) scores for each course into the TAR data compiled thus far. The program lists 18 of the 20 attributes via a one-word synopsis. As noted by a TAR footnote, two of the evaluation attributes (10 and 20) are omitted as not being subject to averaging. Exhibit C shows Professor Corbaci's TAR report with his Teacher-Course Evaluation information added.

Department chairmen have the authority to waive the evaluation of a specific course in those instances they deem advisable, such as

teaching assistant-taught courses or directed readings. In our example, Professor Corbaci's course "Systematic Theology" has no associated TCE scores. The Teaching Activity Report note, "NO RESP FOR TCE," indicates either the course was not evaluated, or evaluation responses were delinquently submitted.

The next major program adds the final data to complete our TAR data file, that is, student grades. Exhibit D shows the completed Teaching Activity Report for Professor Corbaci with student grade information added. Again, a footnote to the TAR is included to clarify any discrepancy between the number of student grades listed and actual course enrollment. Courses where no grades are listed are noted on a separate error listing for followup and, if necessary, correction. *

The fifth major program makes possible a "trial-run" of selected Teaching Activity Reports. These reports are reviewed for accuracy, both in format and data. Special attention is given to the computation of clock hours for cross-listed and team-taught courses.

The final two programs involve the actual printing of the entire Teaching Activity Report. A total of three copies are printed: one for the College Dean, one for the Department Chairman, and one for the individual Professor. For filing purposes, the entire TAR printout is kept on tape.

As with any program, some limitations exist. In the case of the Teaching Activity Report, although we go to great lengths to cross-check and verify the accuracy of our data file, inevitably changes are requested.

A department chairman may wish to redefine his allocation of assigned clock hours, or a professor may desire that his delinquently submitted Teacher-Course Evaluation scores be included in his TAR printout. To accommodate these requests, one is required to establish manually, via punched cards, a separate "Report File" for these individuals and then print a new Teaching Activity Report. Obviously, if change-requests are numerous, this "Report File" becomes a tedious and cumbersome burden.

Results and Implications

For the past three years the Notre Dame Information Systems (NDIS) office has been engaged in developing a management information system. This has involved a streamlining of all the older, more unwieldy systems mentioned above. When the NDIS goal of uniform definitions has been achieved, the ability to produce the TAR will be greatly enhanced.

Even as it now stands, we believe the TAR bears deep-seated implications for what any university is all about, namely, the education of its students and a fruitful engagement in significant research.

We make no claim to having produced anything novel in our Teaching Activity Report. It is simply a practical tool, easily understandable and simply explained, which provides a record of teaching effort. It does not pretend -- it does not even attempt -- to measure the unmeasurable, or to make sophisticated (and often incorrect) guesses about the quality of instructional effort.

What the TAR does do is to assemble the bare "facts" of instruction in eminently readable form so that those most intimately concerned with the business of the University are adequately informed.

If there is one significant theoretical feature of the TAR we can boast of, it is to be found in our emphasis on clock or contact hours rather than credit hours. We have found credit-hour production to be a largely misleading concept, rendering impersonal a process that should be highly personal. The contact hours concept, while saying nothing about the quality of the hours measured, says more while saying less. It says simply that this professor has made contact with so many students on a certain level. Combined with the other input, it says that these students have evaluated his teaching in this or that way, that he has evaluated their efforts in such and such a way, and depending on the dialogue with his chairman, that he has done a good or poor job at one level of instruction.

Specialized, ultra-technical reports tend to become hazy by their demand for a grasp of statistical detail that only a statistician could handle ably. The virtue of TAR is that it sweeps away the haze and replaces it with a clear, if over-simplified, picture of what a teacher does, instruction-wise.

* The interpretation of "letter grade designators" is as follows:

Letter Grade	Value	Legend
A	4.00	Outstanding
A-	3.50	Excellent
B	3.00	Very Good
B-	2.50	Good
C	2.00	Acceptable (lowest passing grade for graduate students)
D	1.00	Passing (zero quality points for graduate students; lowest passing grade for undergraduate students)
F	0	Failure
X	0	Given with the approval of the student's dean in extenuating circumstances beyond the control of the student. It reverts to "F" if not changed within 30 days after the beginning of the next semester.
I	0	Incomplete (reserved for advanced students in advanced studies courses only). It is a temporary and unacceptable grade indicating a failure to complete work in a course. The course work must be completed and the "I" changed prior to the beginning of the next semester's final examination period; otherwise, the "I" grade remains on the transcript and is computed as equivalent to an "F" in calculating averages.

Grades which may be given but which are not included in the computation of the average are as follows:

Letter Grade	
S	Satisfactory work (courses without semester hours of credit or graduate research courses)
U	Unsatisfactory work (courses without semester hours of credit or graduate research courses)
V	Auditor

Grades which are assigned by the registrar, i.e., not to be given by the faculty:

Letter Grade	
W	Withdrew with permission. To secure a "W" the undergraduate student must have the authorization of the dean, and the graduate student must have the authorization of the assistant vice president for advanced studies.
P	Pass in a course taken on a Pass-Fail basis.

FALL 1976 TEACHING ACTIVITY REPORT EXHIBIT A
02-01-77

LEO M. CORBACI
VISITING PROFESSOR
THEOLOGY AND LITURGY

TOTAL ENROLLMENT
*TOTAL UNDUPLICATED CLOCK HOURS
TOTAL UNDUPLICATED STUDENT CREDIT HOURS

	417300 PHIL 552 UNDERS RELIG CONV ALSO LISTED AS 498800 THEO 631	493860 THEO 335 AMER REL THOUGHT	
	496500 THEO 527 SYSTEMAT THEOLOGY TAUGHT WITH HAUERWAS	498800 THEO 631 UNDERS RELIG CONV ALSO LISTED AS 417300 PHIL 552	

FALL 1976 TEACHING ACTIVITY REPORT EXHIBIT B
02-01-77

LEO M. CORBACI
VISITING PROFESSOR
THEOLOGY AND LITURGY

TOTAL ENROLLMENT 63
*TOTAL UNDUPLICATED CLOCK HOURS 7.50
TOTAL UNDUPLICATED STUDENT CREDIT HOURS 165.00

417300 PHIL 552 UNDERS RELIG CONV ENROLLMENT = 4 CLOCK HOURS= 3.00 ALSO LISTED AS 498800 THEO 631	493860 THEO 335 AMER REL THOUGHT ENROLLMENT = 33 CLOCK HOURS= 3.00
496500 THEO 527 SYSTEMAT THEOLOGY ENROLLMENT = 16 CLOCK HOURS= 3.00 TAUGHT WITH HAUERWAS	498800 THEO 631 UNDERS RELIG CONV ENROLLMENT = 10 CLOCK HOURS= 3.00 ALSO LISTED AS 417300 PHIL 552

* TOTAL UNDUPLICATED CLOCK HOURS FOR TEAM-TAUGHT COURSES ARE CALCULATED BY DIVIDING THE NUMBER OF TEAM MEMBERS INTO THE COURSE CLOCK HOURS. FOR CROSS-LISTED COURSES, THE CLOCK HOURS ARE COUNTED ONLY ONCE.

FALL 1976 — TEACHING ACTIVITY REPORT — EXHIBIT C
02-01-77

LEO M. CORBACI
VISITING PROFESSOR
THEOLOGY AND LITURGY

TOTAL ENROLLMENT 63
*TOTAL UNDUPLICATED CLOCK HOURS 7.50
TOTAL UNDUPLICATED STUDENT CREDIT HOURS 165.00

TCE QUESTIONS	417300 PHIL 552 UNDERS RELIG CONV	493860 THEO 335 AMER REL THOUGHT
1. KNOWLEDGE	4.0	3.9
2. ENTHUSIASM	4.0	3.9
3. EFFECTIVENESS	3.5	3.2
4. STIM STUDENTS	4.0	2.8
5. HELPS STUDENTS	4.0	3.5
6. FAIRNESS	4.0	3.4
7. RESP STUDENTS	3.5	3.4
8. ORGANIZATION	3.0	3.4
9. OVERALL RATING	3.0	3.2
11. LECTURES	0.0	3.0
12. DISCUSSION	0.0	3.0
13. ANS QUESTIONS	0.0	3.6
14. INDEP THINKING	0.0	3.2
15. PREPARATION	0.0	3.8
16. PROMPTNESS	0.0	3.7
17. INTELL LEVEL	0.0	3.7
18. READINGS VALUE	0.0	3.0
19. COURSE VALUE	0.0	2.8
	ENROLLMENT = 4	ENROLLMENT = 33
	CLOCK HOURS= 3.00	CLOCK HOURS= 3.00
	ALSO LISTED AS 493800 THEO 631	

TCE QUESTIONS	496500 THEO 527 SYSTEMAT THEOLOGY	498800 THEO 631 UNDERS RELIG CONV
1. KNOWLEDGE	NO	4.0
2. ENTHUSIASM	RESP	4.0
3. EFFECTIVENESS	FOR	3.0
4. STIM STUDENTS	TCE	3.4
5. HELPS STUDENTS		4.0
6. FAIRNESS		3.8
7. RESP STUDENTS		3.4
8. ORGANIZATION		3.3
9. OVERALL RATING		3.9
11. LECTURES		3.7
12. DISCUSSION		2.3
13. ANS QUESTIONS		3.9
14. INDEP THINKING		3.8
15. PREPARATION		3.8
16. PROMPTNESS		4.0
17. INTELL LEVEL		3.7
18. READINGS VALUE		3.8
19. COURSE VALUE		3.3
	ENROLLMENT = 16	ENROLLMENT = 10
	CLOCK HOURS= 3.00	CLOCK HOURS= 3.00
	TAUGHT WITH HAUERWAS	ALSO LISTED AS 417300 PHIL 552

TEACHER-COURSE EVALUATION QUESTIONS 10 AND 20 ARE OMITTED AS NOT BEING SUBJECT TO AVERAGING.

* TOTAL UNDUPLICATED CLOCK HOURS FOR TEAM-TAUGHT COURSES ARE CALCULATED BY DIVIDING THE NUMBER OF TEAM MEMBERS INTO THE COURSE CLOCK HOURS. FOR CROSS-LISTED COURSES, THE CLOCK HOURS ARE COUNTED ONLY ONCE.

EXHIBIT D
02-01-77

FALL 1976 — TEACHING ACTIVITY REPORT

LEO M. CORBACI

VISITING PROFESSOR
THEOLOGY AND LITURGY

TOTAL ENROLLMENT 43
*TOTAL UNDUPLICATED CLOCK HOURS 7.50
TOTAL UNDUPLICATED STUDENT CREDIT HOURS 165.00

TCE QUESTIONS	417300 PHIL 552 UNDERS RELIG CONV						493860 THEO 335 AMER REL THOUGHT						NOTES
1. KNOWLEDGE	4.0	A = 1	P = 0				3.9	A = 4	P = 0				
2. ENTHUSIASM	4.0	A-= 2	U = 0				3.8	A-= 6	U = 0				
3. EFFECTIVENESS	3.5	B = 0	S = 0				3.2	B = 7	S = 0				
4. STIM STUDENTS	4.0	B-= 0	W = 0				2.8	B-= 9	W = 0				
5. HELPS STUDENTS	4.0	C = 0	X = 0				3.5	C = 8	X = 0				
6. FAIRNESS	4.0	D = 0	I = 0				3.4	D = 0	I = 0				
7. RESP STUDENTS	3.5	F = 0	V = 1				3.4	F = 0	V = 0				
8. ORGANIZATION	3.0						3.4						
9. OVERALL RATING	3.0	ENROLLMENT = 4					3.2	ENROLLMENT = 33					
11. LECTURES	0.0	CLOCK HOURS = 3.00					3.0	CLOCK HOURS = 3.00					
12. DISCUSSION	0.0						3.0						
13. ANS QUESTIONS	0.0						3.6						
14. INDEP THINKING	0.0						3.2						
15. PREPARATION	0.0						3.8						
16. PROMPTNESS	0.0						3.7						
17. INTELL LEVEL	0.0						3.7						
18. READINGS VALUE	0.0	ALSO LISTED AS					3.0						
19. COURSE VALUE	0.0	498300 THEO 631					2.8						

TCE QUESTIONS	496500 THEO 527 SYSTEMAT THEOLOGY						498800 THEO 631 UNDERS RELIG CONV						NOTES
1. KNOWLEDGE	NO	A = 0	P = 0				4.0	A = 3	P = 0				
2. ENTHUSIASM	RESP	A-= 4	U = 0				4.0	A-= 6	U = 0				
3. EFFECTIVENESS	FOR	B = 10	S = 0				3.0	B = 0	S = 0				
4. STIM STUDENTS	TCE	B-= 0	W = 1				3.4	B-= 0	W = 0				
5. HELPS STUDENTS		C = 1	X = 0				4.0	C = 0	X = 0				
6. FAIRNESS		D = 0	I = 0				3.8	D = 0	I = 0				
7. RESP STUDENTS		F = 0	V = 0				3.4	F = 0	V = 1				
8. ORGANIZATION							3.3						
9. OVERALL RATING		ENROLLMENT = 16					3.9	ENROLLMENT = 10					
11. LECTURES		CLOCK HOURS = 3.00					3.7	CLOCK HOURS = 3.00					
12. DISCUSSION							2.3						
13. ANS QUESTIONS		TAUGHT WITH					3.9						
14. INDEP THINKING		HAUERWAS					3.8						
15. PREPARATION							3.8						
16. PROMPTNESS							4.0						
17. INTELL LEVEL							3.7						
18. READINGS VALUE							3.8	ALSO LISTED AS					
19. COURSE VALUE							3.3	417300 PHIL 552					

TEACHER-COURSE EVALUATION QUESTIONS 10 AND 20 ARE OMITTED AS NOT BEING SUBJECT TO AVERAGING. NUMBERS FOLLOWING LETTER GRADES INDICATE THE DISTRIBUTION WITHIN CLASS. ENROLLMENT IS TAKEN FROM THE TEACHING LOA REPORT; DUE TO LATE WITHDRAWALS, ETC., THE NUMBER OF GRADES ASSIGNED DOES NOT ALWAYS EQUAL THE ENROLLMENT.

* TOTAL UNDUPLICATED CLOCK HOURS FOR TEAM-TAUGHT COURSES ARE CALCULATED BY DIVIDING THE NUMBER OF TEAM MEMBERS INTO THE COURSE CLOCK HOURS. FOR CROSS-LISTED COURSES, THE CLOCK HOURS ARE COUNTED ONLY ONCE.